



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/796,113	03/10/2004	Myron Spector	1194-176	2494
6449	7590	10/09/2008		
ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, P.C. 1425 K STREET, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20005			EXAMINER GUCKER, STEPHEN	
			ART UNIT 1649	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 10/09/2008	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTO-PAT-Email@rfem.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/796,113	SPECTOR ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Stephen Gucker	1649

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 May 2008.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 2,3,5-7,9-11,14-17,19 and 22-33 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 2,3,5-7,9-11,14-17,19,22-33 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

***Response to Amendment***

1. Applicant's amendment has obviated the grounds of the previous 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph rejection and it has been withdrawn.
2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
4. Claims 2-3, 5-6, 9-11, 14-17, 19, 22-30 and 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geistlich et al. (US 5,837,278; "278") in view of Stensaas et al. (US 4,778,467, "Stensaas") and further in view of Shimizu (US 6,090,117). The '278 patent discloses a single sheet of a resorbable sidewall material consisting essentially of a single layer collagen sheet material having a compact, smooth outer barrier surface so as to inhibit cell adhesion thereon and act as a barrier to prevent passage of cells there through, this sheet material further having a fibrous inner surface opposite the smooth barrier surface (column 1, line 51 to column 2, line 6) derived from collagen membrane peritoneal tissue (column 2, lines

Art Unit: 1649

52-60). This single layer collagen sheet material is identified as Bio-Gide ® by the instant specification (page 3, paragraphs 0017 and 0018), and is the same material disclosed in the '278 patent. The '278 patent does not disclose using Bio-Gide ® to form a nerve regeneration tube for connecting nerve ends or methods of using such. Stensaas teaches methods of forming tubes for nerve regeneration (Figures 1 and 3A-3B; column 9, line 60 to column 12, line 31; and column 9, lines 1-16 and column 16, lines 54-66 (Figures 7A-7B)). Stensaas does not teach a nerve regeneration tube for connecting nerve ends having an inner diameter of about 0.5-5mm and a length of about 10-100mm formed from a single collagen sheet of the '278 patent, or a filling material comprised of a mixture of Type I and Type IV collagen, or collagen fibers having a substantially longitudinal orientation with respect to said tube, or a filling material including laminin as a nerve growth stimulant. Shimizu discloses a nerve regeneration tube and methods of using such comprising of at least three sheets of collagen (column 6, line 48 to column 7, line 50) but which is also about 1-8mm in inner diameter with a length about 28-35mm, but can differ according to the length of the severed portion of the nerve and the thickness of the nerve (column 7, lines 19-31; see also a 10mm long tube in Comparative Example 4), thereby meeting the limitations of the instant claims. Shimizu also teaches filling materials for a nerve regeneration tube comprising laminin and Type IV collagen (column 8, lines 40-55) and collagen Type I solution or fibers having a substantially longitudinal orientation with respect to said tube (column 7, line 55 to column 8, line 13; column 8, line 65 to column 9, line 48). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the single sheet collagen material of the '278 patent known as Bio-Gide ® with the teachings of Stensaas to make tubing out of said single sheet collagen material for

nerve regeneration because Shimizu teaches the advantages of a collagen nerve regeneration tube with one side smooth that inhibits cell permeation, the other side fibrous to promote biological regrowth, which is also taught by the '278 patent. Furthermore, a simpler nerve regeneration tube can be produced that uses less material (single sheet as opposed to at least three sheets of collagen as taught by Shimizu), is quicker and easier to produce, and would have the further advantage of economic savings due to lowered costs of production by reducing the need for at least three sheets of collagen to a single sheet of collagen. The combined references also establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness because the collagen material of the '278 patent has desirable features such as a smooth surface to inhibit cell adhesion on the outside with a fibrous surface to support cells on the inside and simply forming a tube out of this two-sided collagen material is *prima facie* obvious given that collagen nerve regeneration tubes were in use at least as way back as the 1980s (see Hentz et al. and Rosen et al. already of record, IDS filed 3/10/04). Finally, the advantageous characteristics of the two-sided collagen material of the '278 patent would suggest to and motivate the ordinary artisan to fashion the collagen material into a tube with a smooth outside and fibrous inside in order to promote axonal regeneration in the interior of the tube as indicated by Shimizu (column 7, line 55 to column 8, line 13; column 8, line 40 to column 9, line 63), and even Stensaas (column 9, lines 60-67) describes the desirability of a neural regeneration tube with a smooth exterior and a rough interior.

Applicant's arguments filed 10/22/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Both the declaration of Spector and Applicant's arguments are drawn to the making of a neural regeneration tube as described by Shimizu. Both the declaration and the

Art Unit: 1649

arguments assert that if one uses the procedures of Shimizu, a three layer collagen tube is formed with a compressed smooth collagen interior surface, and not the fibrous interior surface as recited in the instant claims. However, the instant rejection is drawn to the use of the single sheet collagen material as a first part (the '278 patent), the forming of said single sheet collagen into a neural regeneration tube as taught by Stensaas (not Shimizu) by, for example, simply rolling the sheet into a tube and fastening the leading surfaces together (e.g. around a nerve) as a second part, and then the remaining claim limitations are taught by Shimizu for the advantages set forth above as the third part of the rejection. Because the single collagen sheet material of the '278 patent already possesses a smooth and a fibrous side, the fabrication procedures of Shimizu are not required nor are they used in the formulation of the rejection.

*Applicant's arguments filed 5/21/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for reasons already of record. To reiterate, the instant rejection is drawn to the use of the single sheet collagen material as a first part (the '278 patent), the forming of said single sheet collagen into a neural regeneration tube as taught by Stensaas (not Shimizu) by, for example, simply rolling the sheet into a tube and fastening the leading surfaces together (e.g. around a nerve) as a second part, and then the remaining claim limitations are taught by Shimizu for the advantages set forth above as the third part of the rejection. Because the single collagen sheet material of the '278 patent already possesses a smooth and a fibrous side, the fabrication procedures of Shimizu are not required nor are they used in the formulation of the rejection. The rejection of record does NOT involve a 3-layer collagen tube; only a single sheet of Bio-Gide ® formed into a tube with the fibrous collagen on the inside of said tube. Therefore, there are no unexpected results because the rejection of record does not*

*involve a tube with a smooth interior. Applicant is attempting to set up a strawman argument by comparing the instant obvious invention to a tube with smooth interior walls and then asserting unexpected results. Unfortunately, that is NOT the grounds of the rejections of record.*

5. Claims 2-3, 5-7, 9-11, 14-17, 19, and 22-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geistlich et al. (US 5,837,278; "278") in view of Stensaas et al. (US 4,778,467, "Stensaas") in view of Shimizu (US 6,090,117) as applied above and further in view of Humes (US 5,429,938) for reasons of record and the following. None of Geistlich or Stensaas or Shimizu teach a mixture of Type I and Type IV collagen in a ratio of about 1:1 for supporting biological activity. Humes does teach the use of Type I and Type IV collagen in about 1:1 ratios to support biological activity (column 3, lines 65-66). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ Humes' ratio of about 1:1 of Type I and Type IV collagen because the other references do not qualitatively teach specific amounts between Type I and Type IV collagen and the artisan would be motivated to look to the Humes reference to supply this missing information if said artisan was actually going to reduce to practice a combination of Type I and Type IV collagen because such information would be required during fabrication and use of the neural regeneration tube.

*Applicant's arguments filed 5/21/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for reasons already of record. In response to applicant's argument that Humes is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In*

*this case, Humes is drawn to Type I and Type IV collagen, the identical materials of the instant application, in a biological context, same as the instant application, with the only difference being that Humes is concerned with growing kidney cells and the instant application is drawn to growing nerves. Collagen is known in the art as a extracellular substrate for the growth of a variety of biological cells, so it is the examiner's position that Humes is indeed analogous, pertinent, and relevant.*

*Concerning the assertion of unexpected results, there are no unexpected results because the rejection of record is not drawn to a tube with a smooth interior. Applicant is trying to set up a strawman argument by comparing the instant obvious invention with a tube with smooth interior walls. Unfortunately, that is NOT the grounds of the rejections of record.*

6. No claim is allowed.
7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1649

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen Gucker whose telephone number is 571-272-0883. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays through Fridays from 0930 to 1800.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Stucker, can be reached at 571-272-0911. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Stephen Gucker

October 10, 2008

/Jeffrey Stucker/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1649